

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been amended, canceled or added in this response (claims 1-11 and 19 were previously canceled). No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Independent claims 12, 13, 18, 30 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Etesse et al (USDPUB 2004/0030781) (hereinafter "Etesse") in view of Angles et al (US 6385592) (hereinafter "Angles"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

As explained in the response to the previous office action mailed on 11/14/2005, the present invention relates to a technique that enables a user to access related operations for a data element in a web page, without requiring the related operations to be manually determined and coded in advance. For example, claim 38 recites:

38. A method of processing a web page comprising:
 automatically classifying a data element in the web page as being of a known data type;
 automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified; and
 causing the related operation to be indicated to a user when the user accesses the web page, to enable the user to invoke the related operation.
(emphasis added).

Etesse and Angles do not disclose or suggest such a method, either individually or in combination.

The Examiner admitted that Etesse does not disclose automatically classifying a data element in the web page as being of a known data type; automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which

the data element has been classified (Final Office Action mailed on 8/7/2006, page 3). The Examiner, however, alleges that Angles teaches these limitations.

As explained in the response to the office action mailed on 11/14/2005, Angles discloses a system for delivering customized electronic advertisements (Abstract). The customized advertisements are selected based on consumer profiles and are then displayed to the consumer. Customizing advertisements to a particular consumer is to determine what content to show to the consumer and what content not to show to the consumer. Thus, customization in Angles is a process of tailoring or selecting content, rather than classifying content as a data type, such as recited in claim 38. Thus, Angles does not teach or suggest classifying a data element in the web page as being of a known data type, and certainly not automatically classifying a data element.

Further more, Angles does not teach or suggest automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified. The Examiner does not specifically explain how Angles teaches or suggests this limitation. Nonetheless, Applicant analyzed the reference and did not find such teaching or suggestion.

In response to Applicant's above explanations, the Examiner contends that Angles discloses consumer profiles which include information regarding a corresponding consumer's interest (Final Office Action mailed on 8/7/2006, page 12). The Examiner alleges that a consumer's interest may be considered as a data type. However, even assuming *arguendo* that a consumer's interest included in the consumer's profile may be considered as a data type, it is not a data element in a web page, which is recited in claim 38.

Further, the Examiner does not respond Applicant's explanation that Angles does not teach or suggest the limitation of automatically determining a related operation that can be

performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified. The Examiner only alleges that Angles discloses sending advertisement based on the consumer's demographic profile, tracking consumer responses to the advertisement and displaying future advertisement customized based on profile and usage history. The actions of sending, tracking and displaying are at most operations related to advertising, not to the Examiner alleged data type "interest" in his argument. Thus, at least for the above reasons, claim 38 is patentable over prior art.

Thus, because Etesse and Angles, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation of claim 38, claim 38 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over the cited arts.

All of the other pending independent claims include limitations similar to those discussed above and, therefore, are also not obvious based on the cited art.

Dependent Claims


In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 10/9/06



Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300